

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1-2 and 5-9 are amended and Claims 10-14 added. Support for the amendments and newly claimed subject matter is located in the originally filed application, such as, for example only, page 1, line 26 to page 2, line 15; page 3, lines 3-10; the Abstract; and in drawing Figures 1-8. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit no new material is presented herein.

June 28, 2005 Personal Interview

Applicants respectfully appreciate the courtesies extended to the Applicants' representative during the personal interview of June 28, 2005 by Examiners Sy and Graham. The points discussed during the interview are incorporated herein.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants respectfully appreciate and acknowledge the indication by the Examiner that Claims 5-8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and include all of the features of a rejected base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants also respectfully appreciate and acknowledge the indication by the Examiner that Claim 9 would be allowable if amended to amended to overcome a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim Objection

Claim 2 is objected to for an informality therein. Applicants have amended the claim responsive to the objection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The claims have been amended responsive to the rejection. As such, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 9 is allowable. Moreover, Applicants respectfully note new independent Claim 11 corresponds to original Claims 1 and 5, which should also be deemed allowable. As Claims 12-14 correspond to original dependent Claims 2-4 and depend from claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit the new dependent Claims 12-14 should also be deemed allowable. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,422,546 to Nemoto et al. (hereinafter “Nemoto”). Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nemoto. Applicants respectfully traverse both rejections for the following reasons.

As explained during the personal interview on June 28, 2005, Claim 1 recites an active type vibration isolating support system including, among other features, the air gap between the fixed and movable cores is adjustable by operating the coupling devices. As was agreed upon during the personal interview on June 28, 2005, Nemoto fails to disclose or suggest such a feature. Rather, Nemoto discloses an active vibration isolation support device that requires exchanging or otherwise replacing the originally installed coupling devices in order to adjust the air gap between the fixed and movable cores. In other words, the air gap between the fixed and movable cores cannot be adjusted simply by operating the coupling devices disclosed by Nemoto.

To qualify as prior art under 35 USC § 102, a single reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Nemoto fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by Claim 1. Moreover, to establish *prima facie* obviousness, each and every feature of the rejected claim must be taught or suggested by the applied art of record. See M.P.E.P. §2143.03. As explained above, Nemoto fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited by Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit Nemoto does not anticipate or render obvious the subject matter recited by Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 1 should be deemed allowable over Nemoto.

Claims 2-8 and 10 depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of both rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding objection and rejections, allowance of Claims 1-14, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event that the filing of this paper is not deemed timely, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any petition fee for the extension of time and any other fees that may be required in relation to this paper can be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Docket No. 107348-00405.**

Respectfully submitted,



Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

CMM/MO:elp